

Publishing A Prohibited Criticism: Richard Simon, Pierre Bayle, and Erudition in Late Seventeenth-Century Intellectual Culture

Timothy Twining

The prohibition of Richard Simon's *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* in Paris in 1678 irrevocably altered Simon's life and work: expelled from the Oratory, he would never regain the same extensive and ready access to Hebrew manuscripts and other such materials that he had enjoyed in the Congregation's library. Where Simon had been able to make use of one of Paris's leading learned publishers, Louis Billaine, his subsequent turn to English and Dutch presses placed him in a significantly different context. Instead of principally being interpreted as a contribution to biblical criticism in the tradition of Jean Morin, Louis Cappel, and Brian Walton, his scholarship instead became associated with other heterodox works, notably those of Spinoza or the Jansenists, which were likewise imported from the Dutch presses into France.¹

This paper will present a new account of these developments by tracing the history of the publication of Simon's works in France and Dutch Republic and their initial reception in France, the Netherlands, and Rome until the mid-1680s. It will demonstrate how a comparative perspective brings out the effects of various systems of control and censorship on learning, and especially biblical scholarship, in operation by the late seventeenth century, and what the result of this was for Simon's work. In paying special attention to the roles played by the *Journal des Sçavans* (1665-) and Pierre Bayle and the *Nouvelles de la République de Lettres* (1684-1687) it will also shed new light on the early history of the learned journal. The cumulative effect of the print, intellectual, and censorial context in which Simon's works came to be published is then brought out through a consideration of their treatment at the hands of the Roman Index. The conclusion will sketch how this new sense of the relationship between the origin of Simon's work and its eventual publication suggests that we need to reconsider to the place of erudition in late seventeenth-century intellectual culture and also, and more generally, how we write the history of erudition in a period in which its decline has so frequently been posited.

1. The Learned Journal And The Republic Of Letters

A defining feature of the early modern 'Republic of Letters' was the exchange of learned news and information through epistolary communication. It was through letters that

¹ For a full account of this interpretation of Simon and his work, see T. Twining, 'Richard Simon and the Remaking of Biblical Criticism', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 3 (2018), 421-87. The *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* is cited throughout as *NRL*, followed by the date of publication, Article/Catalogue number, and page numbers.

early modern scholars crossed confessional, political, and geographical boundaries, shared new manuscript discoveries, discussed philological questions, and generally kept one another current with everything curious that had occurred in the world of learning. Late seventeenth-century scholarly culture was marked by a novel development: the inception of the learned journal. The aims and ambitions of this new medium were set by Denis de Sallo writing pseudonymously in the first issue of the *Journal des Sçavans*, where he outlined how the journal would contain the most recent learned news, including: summaries of recently-published books with short, critical, discussions of their content; eulogies of deceased scholars; the results of natural-philosophical experiments; decisions reached by secular and ecclesiastical tribunals; and, more generally, any other news worthy of the curiosity of men of letters.² If these subjects drew naturally on the topics of epistolary commerce, the form itself differed appreciably in at least two notable ways. First, the journals were intended to appear periodically at regular intervals and, second, they were put into print circulation through an editorial process which decided the order of the articles and organized the contents with titles, tables, and indices.

The result was a commercial product, its success or failure based on the rhythms of the late seventeenth-century book trade. It is therefore unsurprising that although the model originated in Paris it became of particular significance in the Dutch Republic, where the market potential indicated by the spread of counterfeit editions of the *Journal des Sçavans* was confirmed by the rapid success of Pierre Bayle's *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* and its imitators.³ The large number of booksellers in the Republic offered ample material for reviews and there was no need, as in France, to obtain a privilege prior to publication.⁴ The proximity to booksellers and access, through them, to the international trade was especially vital for a journal to flourish. Otto Mencke's *Acta Eruditorum* (1682) was dependent on Leipzig, a crucial centre of the German domestic and international book trade.⁵ As Bayle himself remarked, it was to some degree surprising how long it took until there was Dutch emulation of the French example.⁶

² [Denis de Sallo], *Le Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1665), 'L'Imprimeur au lecteur'.

³ Jean-Pierre Vittu, 'Les contrefaçons du *Journal des savants* de 1665 à 1714', in *Les presses grises: La contrefaçon du livre (XVI^e-XIX^e siècles)*, ed. François Moureau (Paris, 1988), 303-31; Hans Bots, 'Le rôle des périodiques néerlandais pour la diffusion du livre (1684-1747)', in *Le Magasin de l'univers: The Dutch Republic as the Centre of the European Book Trade*, eds. C. Berkvens-Stevelinck et al. (Leiden, 1992), 49-70.

⁴ See Bayle's, 'Préface', in *NRL* (March 1684), sig. *2^v.

⁵ H. Laeven, *The "Acta Eruditorum" Under the Editorship of Otto Mencke (1644-1707): The History of an International Learned Journal Between 1682 and 1707* (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1990), 98-113.

⁶ [Bayle], 'Préface', in *NRL* (March 1684), sig. *2^v. This can probably also be attributed to the significant transitions occurring in the Dutch book trade in the late 1670s and early 1680s, as one generation of native Dutch publishers was replaced by another alongside the arrival of Huguenot *libraire-imprimeurs* from France. See Otto S. Lankhorst, *Reiner Leers (1654-1714): Uitgever & Boekverkoper te Rotterdam* (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1983), 7-9. Lankhorst here concurs with I.H. van Eeghen's periodisation of the early modern Dutch book trade into the following periods: 1572-1680, 1680-1725, 1725-1795. See I.H. van Eeghen, *De Amsterdamse Boekhandel, 1680-1725*, vol. 5: *De Boekhandel van de Republiek 1572-1795* (Amsterdam, 1978), 75-105.

These learned journals by no means replaced the role of correspondence. Where the *Acta Eruditorum* depended on its editor Mencke organising an extensive network of local scholars to review and submit material, so too did Bayle's *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* depend in part on his correspondence, in which one finds letters submitted for direct inclusion in the journal, requests for works to be reviewed, suggestions for future issues, and general remarks on the form, content, and tone of the journal.⁷ This interaction had a significant implication. Although these journals were commercial enterprises, they also existed in a symbiotic relationship with their readership. However far their prefaces announced they would include all the 'news' of the Republic of Letters, this 'Republic' could only be as extensive as the sources and contacts of the author, editor, or bookseller of the journal.

Studies of these journals have tended to adopt one of two strategies to consider the rise of a literary genre which existed across confessional, topographical, and political boundaries and yet whose character was strongly shaped in each case by the specific circumstances of its creation. One choice has been to prioritize the form itself as the object of analysis and attempt to assess the significance of the journals for the history of the Republic of Letters and the transmission of knowledge.⁸ An important counterbalance to these contributions has been a number of detailed studies and collections of studies on specific journals.⁹ There have been comparatively few studies, however, of the actual content of the reviews themselves that go beyond summaries of their articles, the way in which these related to the works of erudition they purported to describe, or how they shaped the reception and circulation of these works.¹⁰

These lines of inquiry matter since these journals marked a notable shift in the scope, genre, and form of learning. The learned journal added an additional layer to the transmission of erudition: where studies of earlier scholarship are often able to specify how or from whom a scholar obtained a given work or line of argument – whether in the form of correspondence or the exchange of books, for example – these journals presented public, frequently vernacular, accounts of scholarship with an open-ended readership. This means it is particularly important to assess how given journals or their compilers characterized the works of scholarship they purported to summarize and, above all, how they reinterpreted or redescribed scholarly works for their own purposes, thereby playing an active role framing future scholarly inquiry. In studying the work of

⁷ Laeven, *Acta Eruditorum*, 147-94; Elisabeth R. Labrousse, 'Les coulisses du journal de Bayle', in *Pierre Bayle: Le Philosophe de Rotterdam*, ed. Paul Dibon (Amsterdam, 1959), 97-141.

⁸ See, for example, and from a wide secondary literature, Anne Goldgar, *Impolite Learning: Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters, 1680-1750* (New Haven, 1995), 54-114; Jeanne Peiffer and Jean-Pierre Vittu, 'Les journaux savants, formes de la communication et agents de la construction des savoirs (17^e-18^e siècles)', *Dix-huitième siècle* (2008), 281-300.

⁹ See, from a similarly wide secondary literature, Laeven, *Acta Eruditorum*; *De "Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique" (1686-1693), een periodiek als trefpunt van geleterd Europa*, eds. H. Bots et al. (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1981); Hans Bots and Lenie van Lieshout, *Contribution à la connaissance des réseaux d'information au début du XVIII^e siècle: Henri Basnage de Beauval et sa correspondance à propos de l'"Histoire des Ouvrages des Savans" (1687-1709)* (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1984).

¹⁰ See though Hubert Bost, *Un "Intellectuel" avant la lettre: Le journaliste Pierre Bayle (1647-1706). L'actualité religieuse dans les Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1994), and J.J.V.M. de Vet, 'La "Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique": Témoignage d'une revue à propos de la lutte de Spinoza à fin du XVII^e siècle', *Lias* 16 (1989), 81-110, for two exceptions in this regard.

Richard Simon, its publication, reception, and transmission from France, to England, the Netherlands, and Rome, this paper intends to make an initial contribution to this broader project.

2. Louis Billaine, Richard Simon, And The Journal Des Sçavans

Richard Simon's Parisian publisher between 1674 and 1681 was Louis Billaine, a prominent *libraire* who had succeeded his father Jean Billaine as the sole bookseller in Paris with the privilege to print the works of the Order of Saint Benedict.¹¹ Known to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz as one of the most capable and intelligent booksellers in Paris, Billaine was a learned man, well-versed in Greek, Latin, Italian, and Spanish.¹² He made several trips overseas in the course of his life, continued an extensive European correspondence, controlled bookshops in other cities – most notably in Rome – and regularly published extensive catalogues of works from Italy, Germany, the Dutch Republic, and England, which could be found at his shops in the Grand Salle du Palais and on the Rue Saint-Jacques.¹³

Throughout the years from 1665 to 1681 (the year of his death) Billaine benefited from the advantage of the new *Journal des Sçavans* to advertise his wares, which were frequently covered by the journal. In 1678, for example, no fewer than sixteen articles informed readers to find the book 'chez Louis Billaine'.¹⁴ These were not solely his own publications and often numbered among them were imports from his national and international trade, including, the *Sanctae Rotomagensis Ecclesiae Concilia ac Synodalia Decreta* (1677), edited by Jean-François Pommeraye, from Rouen, or three works, including John Marsham's *Chronicus Canon* (1672), which had been imported from England.¹⁵ If the diffusion of the *Journal des Sçavans* during this period was as extensive as Jean-Pierre Vittu has indicated, then its readers spent a great deal of time reading about works which were undertaken by, or could be found at the shop of, this Parisian *libraire*.¹⁶

In publishing the works of the then Oratorian Richard Simon, Billaine probably expected similar treatment in the journal. This had been the case for two works Simon published before 1678. Both the *Fides Ecclesiae Orientalis* (1671) and the *Voyage du Mont Liban* (1675) received – in the context of the journal – lengthy reviews by Jean

¹¹ Henri-Jean Martin, 'Les Bénédictins, leurs libraires et le pouvoir. Notes sur le financement de la recherche au temps de Mabillon et Montfaucon', *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 43 (1957), 273-87; Henri-Jean Martin, *Livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVII^e siècle (1598-1710)*, 2 vols. (Geneva, 1999), 2:708.

¹² Christophe Brosseau to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, 10 March 1679, in Leibniz, *Allgemeiner Politischer und Historischer Briefwechsel*, vol. 2: 1676-1679 (Darmstadt, 1927), 435 (§419).

¹³ Martin, *Livre, pouvoirs et société*, 2:711.

¹⁴ [Jean-Paul de la Roque], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1678), 24 Jan, 21, 24; 28 Feb, 76; 21 March, 114; 28 March, 120; 4 April, 129, 134; 25 April, 153; 16 May, 193, [197] [mis-paginated as 193]; 1 Aug, 306; 15 Aug, 321; 22 Aug, 342; 29 Aug, 352; 5 Sep, 357; 21 Nov, 381.

¹⁵ [Jean-Paul de la Roque], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1678), 22 Aug, 342; [Jean-Paul de la Roque], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1678), 28 Feb, 76; 25 April, 153; 16 May, [197 - mis-paginated as 193].

¹⁶ Jean-Pierre Vittu, 'Diffusion et réception du *Journal des savants* de 1665 à 1714', in *La Diffusion et la lecture des journaux de langue française sous l'Ancien régime*, ed. Hans Bots (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 1988), 167-75.

Gallois and Jean-Paul de la Roque.¹⁷ Under the auspices of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Gallois had replaced Denis de Sallo as compiler of the journal after de Sallo lost his position less for his sometimes critical reviews of contemporaries than for his forthright criticism of ultramontane politics and his connections to Port-Royal.¹⁸ Gallois was more circumspect and generally preferred to summarize without extensive additional comments the works of scholarship that he reviewed. The Oratorian's *Fides Ecclesiae Orientalis* was no exception to this. The work was intended by Simon to highlight the linguistic and historical shortcomings of recent contributions to the debate over the Eucharist by both Catholics, Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, and Protestants, notably Jean Claude. While Simon's initial unpublished response to Arnauld and Nicole had caused what would become an irrevocable break between himself and Port-Royal, the published work only emphasized one of these aims: the refutation of the Protestant Claude.¹⁹ Gallois's review reflected this, he described Simon's edition of Gabriel of Philadelphia's works and underlined where they promoted the Roman Catholic side. The review concluded by underlining how Simon had shown the Oriental churches 'croient la Transsubstantiation et adorent l'Eucharistie', among other remarkable things.²⁰

Preoccupied with his role at the Académie des Sciences and in the service of Colbert, Gallois ceded authorship of the journal to de la Roque in late 1674.²¹ The new compiler's treatment of Simon's edition of Jerome Dandini's *Voyage du Mont Liban* was similar to Gallois's.²² De la Roque summarized the choicest aspects of Dandini's journey and then set these in the context of Simon's additions. As de la Roque showed, Simon's comments were more than merely explicative. The Oratorian's additional annotations in the second half of the book offered a strong counterargument to Dandini's interpretation of the Eastern churches: where Dandini and others had seen Greek and Eastern practices as simply heretical, Simon in contrast emphasized – and de La Roque reiterated – that such views misunderstood the Eastern churches on a number of questions since they observed even more closely than the Roman Church 'l'ancien droit et l'ancienne discipline'.²³

3. Publishing A Prohibited Critic: Richard Simon, Reinier Leers, and the Print Trade Between France And The Netherlands

¹⁷ [Jean Gallois], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1672), 37-40; [Jean-Paul de la Roque], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1675), 133-8.

¹⁸ Raymond Birn, 'Le *Journal des Savants* sous l'Ancien Régime', *Journal des savants* (1965), 15–35, at 20-1; Jean-Pierre Vittu, 'La formation d'une institution scientifique: le *Journal des Savants* de 1665 à 1714', *Journal des savants* (2002), 179–203, at 182-4.

¹⁹ Jacques Le Brun, 'Entre la *Perpétuité* et la *Demonstratio Evangelica*', in *Leibniz à Paris (1672-1676)*, 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1978), 2:1-13; Jacques Le Brun and John D. Woodbridge, 'Introduction', in Richard Simon, *Additions aux Recherches curieuses sur la diversité des langues et religions d'Edward Brerewood*, eds. ead. (Paris, 1983), 17-20; John D. Woodbridge, 'La "grande chasse aux manuscrits", la controverse eucharistique et Richard Simon', in *Conflits politiques, controverses religieuses: Essais d'histoire européenne aux 16^e-18^e siècles*, eds. Ouzi Elyada and Jacques Le Brun (Paris, 2002), 168-75.

²⁰ [Jean Gallois], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1672), 37-40.

²¹ Birn, 'Le *Journal des Savants*', 21-23; Vittu, 'La Formation d'une institution scientifique', 182-4.

²² It should be noted that de la Roque did not identify Simon in the review, although the title page reads 'Par R. S. P'.

²³ [Jean-Paul de la Roque], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1675), 136.

In 1679 and thereafter books bearing Billaine's imprint were still regularly reviewed in the *Journal des Sçavans*. One that was absent from these pages, however, was Simon's *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*. The work had been printed and granted a privilege by 1678, yet little could be done when, chiefly at Jacques-Benigne Bossuet's instigation, the book was prohibited and almost the entire print run destroyed.²⁴ The work itself was soon available, reprinted clandestinely by Daniel Elzevier in Amsterdam in 1680.²⁵ The edition published by Elzevier did more than simply reprint Simon's text with some infelicities: it reframed and redescribed it in a way that was distinctly at odds with Simon's own accounts of his project. In particular, it included a new preface, written by Noël Aubert de Versé, which prepared the reader for the extraordinary and bold contents of the work. Simon's rare learning and vast erudition had led him to advance some singular – and singularly dangerous – arguments, de Versé warned – and advertised to – his readers.²⁷

De Versé explicitly framed his redescription of Simon's work in the context of a similar example of scholarship presented as scandal: the 1676 edition of John Marsham's *Chronicus Canon*, published in Leipzig and edited by Otto Mencke.²⁸ Mencke's preface introduced the work as a product of vast erudition, but one tinged with dangerous consequences in its willingness to allow for the apparent derivation of Hebrew from Egyptian religion.²⁹ De Versé transposed Mencke's framing of Marsham's work and applied it to Simon's, as he noted how Simon's extensive learning was counterbalanced by the work's scandalous features, above all its rejection of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.³⁰ Other aspects of the work, de Versé allowed, were more redolent of Simon's confessional than his heterodox purposes, such as the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*'s denial that the sacred texts were preserved by divine providence. Yet De Versé did not think Protestants should shrink from the challenge Simon's scholarship presented: as Jerome had advised with Origen, Tertullian, and others, one should read the book – after having bought it, presumably – and take what was useful while ignoring what was dangerous.³¹ Where scholars have often posited that the later seventeenth century saw a process whereby learning became double-edged, put to purposes beyond its original intentions, here we can briefly glimpse one aspect of a

²⁴ On these events, see now Twining, 'Simon and the Remaking', 468-71.

²⁵ On this printing, see Paul Auvray, *Richard Simon (1638-1712): Étude bio-bibliographique avec des textes inédits* (Paris, 1974), 67-8; Alphonse Willems, *Les Elzevier: Histoire et annales typographiques* (Brussels, 1880), 406-8, 410-11. Elzevier also published Simon's first reply to one of the critics of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, Ezekiel Spanheim, see [Richard Simon], *Réponse à la lettre de M. Spanheim* (Amsterdam, 1680). Elzevier's widow continued publishing works under his imprint from 13 Oct 1680 to March 1681 and this included a Latin translation of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* by Noël Aubert de Versé: Richard Simon, *Historia Critica Veteris Testamenti, sive Historia Textus Hebraici à Mose ad nostra usque Tempora* (Paris [=Amsterdam], 1681).

²⁷ [Noël Aubert de Versé], 'Préface', in Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris [=Amsterdam], 1680), sig. §2^r.

²⁸ John Marsham, *Chronicus Canon* (Leipzig, 1676). On Mencke's editing the work, see Laeven, *Acta eruditorum*, 38.

²⁹ Marsham, *Chronicus Canon*, sigs)(2^r)-(3^v.

³⁰ [De Versé], 'Préface', in Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, sig. §2^{r-v}.

³¹ *Ibid.*, sigs §3^v-§2^r.

process that could have contributed to this, as erudite works were embellished and reframed – most probably with a view to the book trade – in contexts removed from those of their creation.³²

For Simon these events had significant implications: expelled from the Oratory he had little chance in the short-term of publishing his works in France. Meanwhile, in Holland and elsewhere in Europe the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* was now circulating in an imperfect – and newly re-presented – form. Simon had two clear alternative locations if he still sought to publish either the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* or any of the other works he had in preparation: England or the Dutch Republic. Although Simon did initially opt for the former, publishing the *Antiquitates Ecclesiae Orientalis* in London in 1682, it would be in the Dutch Republic that Simon established his most enduring relationship with a single printer-publisher, Reinier Leers, who published all of Simon's most extensive works from 1684 to 1694, when a disagreement over Leers's relationship with Antoine Arnauld and other Jansenists led to a permanent break in their relations.³³

Leers was a central figure in the Dutch trade of his day.³⁴ He played a particularly important role, as his relationship with Simon would show, in the international learned book market, notably becoming a key conduit between two contrasting centres of learning and publishing, the Dutch Republic and Paris, with the first book carrying his imprint appearing in the year Daniel Elzevier died.³⁵ Although well connected with the French authorities, especially later in his career, Leers nevertheless counted among his specialities publishing the works of learned Catholics whose books could not be published in France, including, alongside Simon, those by Nicolas Malebranche and Antoine Arnauld.³⁶ Leers made several trips to France during the 1680s, meeting Simon on at least one of them.³⁷ He took a keen interest in promoting Simon's work, which included seeking and facilitating Simon's replies to his opponents, such as Isaac Vossius.³⁸

³² For recent articulations of forms of this thesis, see Jean-Louis Quantin, 'Erudition and Orthodoxy: John Fell and Patristic Scholarship in Restoration Oxford', *Erudition and the Republic of Letters* 1 (2016), 43–78, at 77–8; Jan Loop, *Johann Heinrich Hottinger: Arabic and Islamic Studies in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, 2013), 94–5, 214–16.

³³ For Simon's works published in England, see Auvray, *Simon*, 69–70; Scott Mandelbrote, 'Isaac Vossius and the Septuagint', in *Isaac Vossius (1618–1689) between science and scholarship*, eds. Eric Jorink and Dirk van Miert (Leiden, 2012), 85–117, at 104–6; Twining, 'Simon and the Remaking', 473–4. On Simon and Leers, see R. Simon to J.A. Turretini, 14 Oct 1694, 217 (§1), in Auvray, *Simon*; Lankhorst, *Leers*, 57–9.

³⁴ Otto S. Lankhorst, 'Reinier Leers, een Europese Libraire te Rotterdam (1676–1709)', *Documentatieblad Werkgroep Achttiende Eeuw* 53/54 (1982), 21–39; Lankhorst, *Leers*, 15–127.

³⁵ Martin, *Livre, pouvoirs et société*, 2: 748–53; Lankhorst, *Leers*, 93–106. For Elzevier's own extensive trade with France, see Willems, *Les Elzevier*, ccxxii–ccxlv.

³⁶ For Leers's later contacts with the French authorities, see Martin, *Livre, pouvoirs et société*, 2:752–3. Pierre Bayle suggested in the preface to the first issue of the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* that the freedom extended to the Dutch presses made them the refuge of Catholic authors as much as Protestant ones: *NRL* (March 1684), 'Préface', sigs *2^v–*3^r.

³⁷ Simon to R. P. B[ordes], Jan 1692, in Richard Simon, *Lettres choisies*, ed. Antoine-Augustin Bruzen de la Martinière, 4 vols. (Amsterdam, 1730), 4:187 (§26).

³⁸ See, for example, Simon to unnamed, 11 Feb 1685, 215, in Auvray, *Simon*.

However, being printed clandestinely, whether by Elzevier or by Leers, created notable obstacles for the circulation of Simon's works. The book trade between France and the Dutch Republic in the late seventeenth century was strictly circumscribed, especially following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in October 1685.³⁹ The trade between the two countries – licit and illicit – ran mainly by sea from the Dutch Republic to Rouen and then – the most testing part of the voyage – into Paris itself.⁴⁰ The difficulties involved in importing books are reflected in correspondence of the time: writing from Rotterdam Pierre Bayle informed his brother Jacob that a combination of thorough searches and strict penalties left people wary of importing contraband books for fear of losing their whole cargo.⁴¹ Simon's works, along with those of Arnauld, Malebranche, and others published by Leers, can be found throughout extant catalogues of books seized by the authorities.⁴² Although we often lack extensive direct evidence of the successes of the authorities against the wiles of the booksellers, there is, nonetheless, indirect evidence in at least two forms: comments in correspondence as to the difficulty in obtaining books published in the Dutch Republic in Paris and the strategies adopted by authors and publishers to evade detection. Complaints regarding the former are widespread throughout the early to mid-1680s. In 1682, for example, Gallois wrote to Christiaan Huygens in The Hague requesting copies of Simon and Spinoza's work to be sent to Paris since such works could not be found there. Although Simon's work was unavailable Huygens could do his best to supply a copy of Spinoza's.⁴³ Even figures such as Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet could be inconvenienced. Having heard that Jean Le Clerc's response to Simon, the *Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande* (1685) – containing ideas more injurious to Scripture than the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* – had recently been published he did his best to obtain a copy as quickly as possible, writing to Claude Nicaise to find out if any such could be obtained from Geneva, since there was no possibility of finding the work in Paris.⁴⁴

Writers and publishers adopted various strategies to mislead the authorities, notably including the employment of false title-pages with new deceptive titles, anonymous or pseudonymous authorship, and providing false places of publication. Simon's works were no strangers to these schemes. The Elzevier edition of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, for example, often carried the title *Histoire de la religion des Juifs, et De leur établissement en Espagne et autres parties de l'Europe, où ils se sont retirés*

³⁹ Anne Sauvy, *Livres saisis à Paris entre 1678 et 1701* (The Hague, 1972), 5; Daniel Roche, *Les Républicains des lettres: Gens de culture et Lumières au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1988), 29-46; Raymond Birn, 'Book Production and Censorship in France, 1700-1715', in *Books and Society in History*, ed. Kenneth E. Carpenter (New York, 1983), 145-71.

⁴⁰ On this trade, see Jean-Dominique Mellot, *L'édition rouennaise et ses marchés (vers 1600 - vers 1730). Dynamisme provincial et centralisme parisien* (Paris, 1998), 610-36.

⁴¹ Bayle to Jacob Bayle, 12 April 1683, in *Correspondance de Pierre Bayle*, eds. Elizabeth Labrousse et al., 15 vols (Oxford, 1999-2017), 3:335 (§221).

⁴² Sauvy, *Livres saisis*, §158, §164, §180, §232, §255, §311, §337, §471, §722, §723, §1048, §1056.

⁴³ Christiaan Huygens to Jean Gallois, 19 Nov 1682, in Huygens, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 8: *Correspondance 1676-1684* (The Hague, 1899), 401-2 (§2284).

⁴⁴ Bossuet to Claude Nicaise, 11 July 1685, *Correspondance de Bossuet*, vol. 3: (1684-1688), eds. C. Urbain and E. Levesque (Paris, 1910), 107-9 (§335).

après la destruction de Jerusalem.⁴⁵ Simon's publications of the 1680s similarly used a whole series of pseudonyms, including 'Origenes Adamantius', 'Jérôme à Costa', 'Jean Reuchlin', 'le S^r de Moni', and others. Leers's imprints likewise often carried false places of publication and for Simon's works these typically involved use of the imprint 'Francfort, Chez Frederic Arnaud' in order to make the work less suspect in Catholic countries.⁴⁶ This strategy – the use of an imprint amenable to Catholic authorities – was a well-known seventeenth-century device, and a source of enduring frustration for authorities such as the Holy Office in Rome.⁴⁷

Prohibition and censorship created patterns of absence, as works that could have been the common currency of published discussion instead became the subject of subterfuge. Where Simon's earlier works published in Paris received two full reviews in the *Journal des Sçavans*, this would not be the case for those published following 1678. Aside from the two short discussions of Simon's proposal for a new Polyglot Bible the only additional review was in 1682, where three pages of the June 22 issue were given to the *Antiquitates Ecclesiae Orientalis*, a compendium of letters from earlier scholars together with a life of Jean Morin written by Simon. The review was critical of Simon's biography, in which Simon had harshly criticized his Oratorian predecessor, but strongly commended the letters of those he described as the most learned men of the century, reserving especial praise for two letters from the Samaritans to Joseph Scaliger.⁴⁹ As much as de la Roque's decision to review the work could be put down to the lustre of the collection of scholars, Scaliger foremost among others including leading Catholic scholars such as Jean Morin, Lucas Holstenius, and Leo Allatius, so too do other reasons connected to the book trade explain why it can be found in de la Roque's journal.⁵⁰ Through Henri Justel Simon had had the work printed in London and it was now available in Paris at the shops of François Muguet, Antoine Dezallier and, Sebastian Mabre-Cramoisy.⁵¹ Where the majority of Simon's works would henceforth be

⁴⁵ Rabbi Moses Levi [Richard Simon], *Histoire de la religion des Juifs, et de leur établissement en Espagne et autres parties de l'Europe, où ils se sont retirés après la destruction de Jerusalem* (Amsterdam, 1680); Sauvy, *Livres saisis*, §158.

⁴⁶ Le Sr. de Moni [Richard Simon], *Histoire critique de la Créance et des Coûtumes des Nations du Levant* ('Francfort: Frederic Arnaud', 1684); Jérôme à Costa [Richard Simon], *Histoire de l'Origine, et du Progrès des Revenus Ecclesiastiques* ('Francfort: Frederic Arnaud', 1684); Origenes Adamantius [Richard Simon], *Novorum Biblitorum Polyglottorum Synopsis* ('Utrecht: Frederic Arnaud', 1684); I.H. Ambrosius [Richard Simon], *Ambrosii ad Origenem Epistola, De Novis Bibliis Polyglottis* ('Utrecht: Frederic Arnaud', 1685); Richard Simon, *Opuscula Critica adversus Isaacum Vossium* ('Edinburgh: John Calderwood', 1685); Hieronymus le Camus [Richard Simon], *Judicium de nupera Isaaci Vossii ad iteratas P. Simonii Objectiones Responsione* ('Edinburgh: John Calderwood', 1685); Jean Reuchlin [Richard Simon], *Dissertation critique sur la nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* ('Francfort: Frederic Arnaud', 1688). All of these were printed by Leers in Rotterdam: see Lankhorst, *Leers*, 215-17. Leers used these strategies across his publications for both Catholic and Protestant authors. See Otto S. Lankhorst, 'Reinier Leers: Libraire-Imprimeur à Rotterdam (1654-1714), et ses contrefaçons', in *Les presses grises: La contrefaçon du livre (XVI^e-XIX^e siècles)*, ed. François Moureau (Paris, 1988), 50-63.

⁴⁷ Lankhorst, *Leers*, 212-15 lists, alongside seven such for Simon, other works for which Leers employed these techniques, including eight works by Antoine Arnauld, two by Pierre Bayle, and one each from Jacques Basnage, Pierre Jurieu, Isaac Papin and Pasquier Quesnel.

⁴⁹ [Jean-Paul de la Roque], *Journal des Sçavans* (Paris, 1682), 183-[6] (mispaginated as 184).

⁵⁰ Auvray, *Simon*, 69-70.

⁵¹ [de la Roque], *Journal des Sçavans* (1682), 183. On the printing, see Auvray, *Simon*, 69-71; on Mabry-Cramoisy, see Martin, *Livre, pouvoirs et société*, 2:715-17.

imported, often illicitly, and could not be sold openly, the *Antiquitates* was available in the stores of some of the largest *libraires* of the day and, perhaps not by coincidence, could be read about in the *Journal des Sçavans*.

This precise suggestion does involve some speculation, but the broader point requires less: where de la Roque could praise Scaliger, Morin and others as the greatest scholars of the century, the figure subsequent historians would view as their equal in de la Roque's era was no longer able to be read – or even reviewed – without difficulty in France. When de la Roque was removed from the editorship of the journal he claimed, Raymond Birn notes, that it was hard to compete with the Dutch journals since they were able to speak more freely and review whichever books they chose.⁵² It followed, as Pierre Bayle put it in the preface to the first issue of the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, that the Netherlands was particularly favourable for the creation of a 'Journal des Sçavans'.⁵³

4. Pierre Bayle and the *Nouvelles De La République Des Lettres*

The success or failure of a journal depended on a *libraire-imprimeur* who was responsible for its publication and provided books to review and an able and willing author or editor. In Henri Desbordes and Pierre Bayle, the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* had both. It was the second journal launched by Henri Desbordes since he had left Saumur for Amsterdam.⁵⁴ In France he had been imprisoned briefly for publishing Jurieu's *Préservatif contre le changement de religion* (1680) and his move to the Netherlands in 1682 followed soon after.⁵⁵ Desbordes's was a printing family who specialized before and after his flight in publishing the works of members of the Reformed, notably those either based in Saumur or those connected to members of the Academy there and their distinctive theological positions.⁵⁶ His business in Amsterdam continued even further in this direction, with Desbordes publishing the works of Charles Le Cène, Jean Le Clerc, and Claude Pajon, amongst others.⁵⁷ Like any *libraire-imprimeur* of course, Desbordes would not expect his customers to number among the members of his confession alone and the contents of the journal would reflect this. His

⁵² Birn, 'Le Journal des Savants', 24-5.

⁵³ *NRL* (March 1684), 'Préface', sigs *2^v-*3^r.

⁵⁴ See Olivier Bloch, 'Introduction', in id., *Parité de la vie et de la mort. La Réponse du médecin Gaultier* (Paris, 1993), 27-32, 39-54.

⁵⁵ Jean Le Clerc to Philipp van Limborch, 10 March 1682, in Jean Le Clerc, *Epistolario*, 4 vols (Florence, 1987–1997), ed. Mario Sina (Florence, 1987), 1:39 (§11); I.H. van Eeghen, *De Amsterdamse Boekhandel, 1680-1725*, vol. 3: *Gegevens over de Vervaardigers, hun Internationale Relaties en de Uitgaven A-M* (Amsterdam, 1965), 88-9.

⁵⁶ On Desbordes, see Louis Desgraves, 'Le rôle des imprimeurs et des éditeurs protestants émigrés, hors de France, dans la circulation des oeuvres', in *Horizons européens de la littérature française au XVII^e siècle: L'Europe, lieu d'échanges culturels? La circulation des oeuvres et des jugements au XVII^e siècle*, ed. Wolfgang Leiner (Tübingen, 1988), 299-307.

⁵⁷ [Pierre Jurieu], *Le janséniste convaincu de vaine sophistication* (Amsterdam, 1683); [Charles Le Cène], *De l'état de l'homme après le péché et de sa prédestination au salut* (Amsterdam, 1684); Claude Pajon, *Remarques sur l'avertissement pastoral* (Amsterdam, 1685). Le Clerc had almost certainly known Desbordes from his time in Saumur. See Archives Départementales Maine-et-Loire, notary records of Jean Baranger, 5E69/375, fol. 15^v. I should like to thank Margreet Dieleman and David van der Linden for information regarding this.

decision to found two journals – and his unwillingness to cede the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* to Leers in 1687 – likewise testified to his desire to be proprietor of a successful journal.

In Bayle Desbordes found an ideal redactor. Bayle had been aware of the *Journal des Sçavans* from its earliest years, and in time had come to level a series of specific criticisms against how it operated: the *Journal* discussed too few works – many of which were already dated by the time the reviews appeared – and those on the basis of the editor's predilections, rather than because they were either the best or universally well-received.⁵⁸ The lengthy preface to the first issue of the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* was designed to pre-empt the objections of similar detractors. There, Bayle, aware of the possible charges of confessional bias, outlined from the outset that he would treat Catholic and Reformed works alike in the pages of the journal without partiality. He also underlined how the print trade of the Republic provided a wide range – wider than Paris, most notably – of works to review.⁵⁹

It was Bayle's local context in Rotterdam that meant he played a crucial role in the dissemination of Richard Simon's work. Within a short time following his arrival in the city in late 1681 Bayle had familiarized himself with the prominent local booksellers and with one of these, the man who, as we have seen, would become Simon's Dutch publisher, Reinier Leers, he developed a long-term friendship and, on occasion, working relationship.⁶⁰ Leers published one of Bayle's earliest works, the *Pensées diverses* (1682), disguising it, as he would Simon's, with a false imprint, and within a short time Bayle had also acted as a go-between for Leers in arranging for the publication of works by Jacques Basnage, Daniel de Larroque and Jacques Lenfant.⁶¹ These collaborations set the groundwork for the future in which Leers became Bayle's principal publisher.⁶² Following the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, moreover, Leers's shop played host to

⁵⁸ Jacob Bayle to Pierre Bayle, 11 Aug 1667, *Bayle Correspondance*, 1:19-20 (§7); Pierre Bayle to Jacob Bayle, 17 Aug 1675, *Bayle Correspondance*, 2:281 (§109).

⁵⁹ *NRL* (March 1684), 'Préface', sigs *2^v-*3^r.

⁶⁰ Elizabeth Labrousse, *Pierre Bayle*, vol. 1: *Du pays de foix à la cité d'Erasmus* (Dordrecht, 1985), 178-83; Hubert Bost, *Pierre Bayle* (Paris, 2006), 172-9.

⁶¹ [Pierre Bayle], *Lettre à M. L. A. D. C. Docteur de Sorbonne. Où il est prouvé par plusieurs raisons tirées de la Philosophie, et de la Théologie, que les Comètes ne sont point le présage d'aucun malheur* (Cologne: Pierre Marteau [=Rotterdam: Reinier Leers], 1682). For the history of the 'Cologne: Pierre Marteau' imprint, see Léonce Janmart de Brouillant, *La liberté de la presse en France aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles: Histoire de Pierre du Marteau imprimeur à Cologne* (Paris, 1888); for its use by Leers, see Lankhorst, *Leers*, 36-8. These works were: [Jacques Basnage], *Examen des méthodes proposées par M^s de l'Assemblée du Clergé de France, en l'année 1682* (Cologne, 1684); [Daniel de Larroque], *Le Prosélyte abusé: ou Fausses vûes de Mr. Brueys dans l'examen de la séparation des Protestans* (Rotterdam, 1684); [Jacques Lenfant], *Considérations générales sur le Livre de Mr. Brueys* (Rotterdam, 1684). See Labrousse, *Bayle*, 1:182; Lankhorst, *Leers*, 144-5, 213-14; Jacques Basnage to Bayle, Oct-Nov 1683, *Bayle Correspondance*, 3:404 (§233); Daniel de Larroque to Bayle, Oct-Nov 1683, *Bayle Correspondance*, 3:409 (§234); Jacques Lenfant to Le Clerc, Dec 1683, Le Clerc, *Epistolario*, 1:111 (§29).

⁶² Lenie van Lieshout, *The making of Pierre Bayle's Dictionnaire historique et critique* (Amsterdam and Maarssen, 2001); Lankhorst, *Leers*, 51-69.

a regular meeting of learned French Protestants that centered on Bayle, Basnage, and the latter's brother Henri Basnage de Beauval.⁶³

5. Richard Simon, Learning, and Commerce in the *Nouvelles De La République Des Lettres*

Bayle's position as compiler of the journal and close cooperation with Leers intersected with his own longstanding interest in Simon's work. This had been in evidence as early as the mid-1670s, where Bayle's correspondence with Vincent Minutoli and his brother Jacob Bayle shows him closely following the then Oratorian's earliest publications.⁶⁴ It was also at this time that Bayle met Henri Justel, Simon's Huguenot acquaintance and a man responsible for informing many others, most notably Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, about the progress of Simon's work.⁶⁵ Justel and Bayle would subsequently exchange news and information about Simon's respective publications in England and France, on occasion sending each other copies of these and other works via an intermediary, the merchant Nicolas Maurice.⁶⁶ Bayle performed the same role for others, albeit from a more one-sided position. His correspondence with Daniel de Larroque in Paris and Jacques Lenfant in Heidelberg finds him being requested precise information concerning Simon throughout the period in which he composed the journal.⁶⁷

The *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* saw Bayle provide the public, commercial side of these epistolary concerns, as he combined learning with due attention to the commercial demands of the print trade. His discussions of works reprinted in the Dutch Republic frequently highlighted either the enduring value of the work in question or emphasized how it improved on the work's previous editions. Two cases from April 1686 illustrate this. In this issue Article IV was dedicated to a new edition of the *Opera omnia* (1686) of John Lightfoot, which had just been published by Leers.⁶⁸ Bayle introduced the work with a summary history of its printing: although he admitted the work had been in progress for a long time, he proceeded to explain that such important books lost none of their value with age. The delay, moreover, largely resulted from the correctness of this new edition.⁶⁹ In Article VI, Bayle reviewed Arnout Leers's recent second edition of John Spencer's *De legibus Hebraeorum* (1686).⁷⁰ Bayle's review began right where a bookseller would want by discussing the advantages of Leers's

⁶³ Gerald Cerny, 'Jacques Basnage and Pierre Bayle: An Intimate Collaboration in Refugee Literary Circles and in the Affairs of the Republic of Letters, 1685-1706', in *De l'humanisme aux lumières, Bayle et le protestantisme*, eds. M. Magdelaine et al. (Oxford, 1996), 495-507.

⁶⁴ See, e.g. Bayle to Vincent Minutoli, 28 May 1675, *Bayle Correspondance*, 2:176 (§93); Bayle to Jacob Bayle, 29 June 1675, *Bayle Correspondance*, 2:214 (§101).

⁶⁵ On Justel, Simon, and Leibniz, see Twining, 'Simon and the Remaking', 468-71.

⁶⁶ H.C. Hazewinkel, 'Pierre Bayle à Rotterdam', *Pierre Bayle: Le Philosophe de Rotterdam*, ed. Paul Dibon (Amsterdam, 1959), 20-47, at 26.

⁶⁷ Daniel de Larroque to Pierre Bayle, Aug-Sept 1684, *Bayle Correspondance* 5:69 (§327); Pierre Bayle to Jacques Lenfant, 5 October 1684, *Bayle Correspondance* 5:113-14 (§341).

⁶⁸ John Lightfoot, *Opera omnia*, 2 vols. (Rotterdam, 1686).

⁶⁹ *NRL* (April 1686), Art. IV, 408-9. See further *NRL* (May 1686), 598.

⁷⁰ John Spencer, *De legibus Hebraeorum ritualis, et earum rationibus* (The Hague, 1686). Arnout was Reinier's brother: see Lankhorst, *Leers*, 10-12. All subsequent references to 'Leers' refer to Reinier unless stated otherwise.

edition, where, among much else, it corrected the faults of earlier versions and added further notes and corrections the author had placed at the end of the original edition.⁷¹

In the case of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* this conjunction between learning and commerce took on a notable urgency. In December 1684 Bayle devoted an extensive article to Leers's edition of the book.⁷² This edition had a new preface that outlined how it superseded the existing editions and explained why Protestant readers should not avoid reading it for fear of Catholic polemic.⁷³ Bayle did more than simply comment on this new edition: he paraphrased – in some instances even transposing word-for-word – the first two paragraphs of the new preface. Between this and February 1685's issue, however, news had reached Rotterdam that Amsterdam's 'Compagnie des Libraires' were printing a counterfeit edition of Leers's text.⁷⁴ The *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* soon contained information warning readers to avoid purchasing that edition, advertising that Leers had already prepared a further edition to supersede it that would contain a 'curious [curieuse]' additional text, the 'Response' to Simon's work from 'Pierre Ambrun'.⁷⁵ Subsequent editions of Simon's work, and Bayle's reviews, informed the reader not to accept any editions as legitimate unless they came from Leers's press.⁷⁶

There were other ways in which Bayle's journal met the requirements of the trade alongside providing intellectual news. The *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, like the *Journal des Sçavans*, alerted readers not simply to the existence of new works, but informed them where they could buy them. This mattered to contemporary booksellers. In June 1684 Bayle reviewed the *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitariorum* (1684), where, having provided the details of the imprint, Bayle added that it could be found in Amsterdam at Henri Wetstein's store.⁷⁷ How do we know this was important for Wetstein? The answer can be found six months later. In April 1685 Jean Le Clerc wrote to Bayle with a message from Wetstein: the latter had given Le Clerc a copy of the Socinian Stanisław Lubieniecki's *Historia Reformationis Polonicae* (1685) for Bayle and wanted to make certain Bayle would review the work and mention that the book could be found in Wetstein's shop.⁷⁸ It was no doubt to Wetstein's displeasure that Bayle overlooked the latter request in May's issue.⁷⁹ In the case of Simon's work this subsidiary role played by the journal was similarly important in decoding for readers how and where to purchase books published by Leers that contained imprints with false places of publication, as Bayle told his readers that while the imprint might read 'Francfort, chez

⁷¹ *NRL* (April 1686), Art. VI, 430.

⁷² *NRL* (December 1684), Art. XI, 506-20.

⁷³ *ibid.*, 507-13; Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Rotterdam, 1685), sigs *2^r-[*4^v]. Subsequent references will always specify which edition of the *Histoire critique* is under discussion.

⁷⁴ Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Amsterdam, 1685).

⁷⁵ *NRL* (February 1685), 213; *NRL* (March 1685), Cat. VI, 331-5. This, the 'seventh' edition, was advertised on the verso of the title page in Leers's subsequent editions. See Simon, *Histoire critique* (Rotterdam, 1685), sig. [*1]^v.

⁷⁶ Simon, *Histoire critique* (Rotterdam, 1685), sig. [*1]^v; *NRL* (March 1685), Cat. VI, 331.

⁷⁷ *NRL* (June 1684), Art. VIII, 393.

⁷⁸ Jean Le Clerc to Pierre Bayle, 14 April 1685, *Bayle Correspondance*, 5:341 (§411).

⁷⁹ *NRL* (May 1685), May, Cat. X, 567.

Frederic Arnaud' they should nonetheless know that work could be found in Rotterdam, in Leers's shop.⁸⁰

The history of print culture is here also part of the intellectual history of late seventeenth-century learned culture. While Bayle indicated where readers could find books with false imprints relating to their place of publication, he also revealed – albeit often discretely – who lay behind works printed anonymously or with pseudonymous imprints. This was something Bayle alerted his correspondents to: writing to Theodor Jansson van Almeloveen in early 1686 Bayle informed him that if one read the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* carefully one would uncover a number of authors behind anonymous works.⁸¹ The best example of this in Simon's case – and in the setting of pseudonymous publication – came in the May 1684 issue when in two consecutive articles Bayle reviewed Simon's *Histoire critique de la Créance et des Coûtumes des Nations du Levant* (1684) and *Histoire de l'Origine et du Progrès des Revenus Ecclésiastiques* (1684). The former claimed to be by 'le Sieur de Moni', one of Simon's apparently less-deceptive pseudonyms. In the review Bayle implied Simon was the author on a number of occasions: he noted how Simon had already published a considerable contribution to the debate between Arnauld and Claude on the subject of transubstantiation; he discussed Thomas Smith's recent criticism of Simon and the responses this work made to Smith's criticisms; finally, he concluded with a reference to Simon's edition of the *Voyage du Mont Liban*.⁸² There were ample hints, therefore, for the reader to deduce that 'le Sieur de Moni' was 'Le P. Simon'. The work in the subsequent review, the *Histoire de l'Origine et du Progrès des Revenus Ecclésiastiques*, carried a different pseudonym: 'Jerôme à Costa'. In the first paragraph Bayle remarked that the 'Jerôme à Costa' referred to here was surely the same as the 'le Sieur de Moni' of the preceding article, where the probable ascription was confirmed by the character of the two works, their precise and fair spirit, and their uncommon degree of learning.⁸⁴

The most extensive role Bayle played in the printing, publishing, and publicizing of Simon's work came in the case of Simon's *Novorum Bibliorum Polyglottorum Synopsis*, published in 1684 under the pseudonym 'Origenes Adamantius'.⁸⁵ Written in the form of a letter to 'I. H. Ambrosius' and dated to the 20 August of that year, Simon set out a detailed proposal for a new polyglot edition of the Bible, which aimed to improve upon the editions of Paris and London.⁸⁶ He followed this with a second letter, a reply from 'Ambrosius' to 'Origenes', which commented on the progress made since the first, and repeated his proposals with some additional suggestions.⁸⁷

In his reviews, Bayle explained and clarified at some length the contents of each tract.⁸⁸ More notably, he drew out and emphasized a further feature of the *Synopsis*. This

⁸⁰ For cases of this, see *NRL* (May 1684), Art. II, 228; *NRL* (May 1684), Art. III, 243.

⁸¹ Pierre Bayle to Theodor Jansson van Almeloveen, 7 March 1686, 307, *Bayle Correspondance* 6:307 (§529).

⁸² *NRL* (May 1684), Art. II, 233-4, 242-3.

⁸⁴ *NRL* (May 1684), Art. III, 244.

⁸⁵ [Simon], *Novorum Bibliorum Polyglottorum Synopsis*, 3.

⁸⁶ See further Twining, 'Simon and the Remaking', 481-4.

⁸⁷ [Simon], *Ambrosii ad Origenem Epistola*.

⁸⁸ *NRL* (October 1684), Art. XIII, 295-301; *NRL* (January 1685), Art. IX, 69-80.

pamphlet was headed with an address from the bookseller to the reader, which reiterated that it was a request for suggestions to improve the prospective polyglot and gave a list of booksellers to which the reader might send his suggestions.⁸⁹ Bayle reiterated the request, and encouraged his readers to send in their comments. In the review of the *Epistola* Bayle went further still. He updated his readers that Leers had shown him the great number of replies that the request had elicited, the majority of them from learned Protestants. But he also noted some ‘bon Protestans’ were nervous since they suspected the Catholic compiler of the prospective polyglot would use the scheme in favour of the furtherance of that religion. Bayle assuaged their fears: he assured them the author of the proposal would not conduct himself in such a way, and he then explained at length why the history of the biblical text, particularly its transmission through scribal reproduction, demanded an embrace of the textual and philological learning embodied in the polyglot.⁹²

6. Richard Simon, Jean Le Clerc, and Confessional Division in the Republic of Letters

Only Nicolas Malebranche, Antoine Arnauld, and Pierre Jurieu received more articles and catalogue entries for their works in Bayle’s *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* than Richard Simon.⁹³ The lengthiest reviews – notably those for the *Histoire critique de la Créance et des Coûtumes des Nations du Levant* and the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* – extensively summarized their content, explained the work’s print history, and placed it in the context of the contemporary debates to which it contributed.⁹⁴ Bayle’s appreciation and exposition of Simon’s learning was notable, and for contemporaries could even be suspected of affecting the circulation of the *Nouvelles de la République* itself. After entering France relatively freely between May and December 1684, the start of 1685 saw a change on the part of the French authorities, who began to

⁸⁹ [Simon], *Novorum Bibliorum Polyglottorum Synopsis*, sig. [A1]^v. The four booksellers were Daniel Horthemels (Paris), Jean de Beaulieu (London), Johann David Zunner (Frankfurt), and Reiner Leers (Rotterdam). In addition to Leers, at least two of the other three booksellers listed here played further roles in the circulation of Simon’s books throughout Europe in the mid-1680s. De Beaulieu, who by 1684 had established a shop on St. Martin’s Lane in London, was listed on some imprints of Simon’s *Histoire de l’Origine et du Progrès des Revenus Ecclésiastiques* and *Histoire critique de la Créance et des Coûtumes des Nations du Levant*. See Trinity College, Cambridge, L.13.28 and U.24.30, respectively. On de Beaulieu, see Katherine Swift, “‘The French-Booksellers in the Strand’: Huguenots in the London book trade, 1685-1730”, *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 25 (1990), 123–39, at 125–6. Horthemels, meanwhile, was one of Leers’s contacts (first in Brussels and then later in Paris), played an important role in the Roman Index’s encounter with Simon’s work, and appeared on an imprint of Simon’s *Fides Ecclesiae Orientalis* in 1686. See Reinier Leers to Nicolas Malebranche, 11 June 1685, 226 (§1), in Lankhorst, *Leers*; Richard Simon, *Fides Ecclesiae Orientalis* (Paris, 1686); and below, 000. On Zunner, a prominent bookseller in Frankfurt and correspondent of Leibniz, see *Lexikon des gesamten Buchwesens*, vol. 3: *Petreius-Zyprische Schrift. Register*, eds. Karl Löffler and Joachim Kirchner (Leipzig, 1937), 641.

⁹² *NRL* (January 1685), Art. IX, 77–9.

⁹³ See Bost, *Un “Intellectuel” avant la lettre*, 246–7, 287–9, 301, 327–8.

⁹⁴ *NRL* (May 1684), Art. II, 228–43; *NRL* (December 1684), Art. XI, 506–20.

prevent its entry into France.⁹⁵ Commenting on these events, François Janiçon provided three reasons why the journal's free circulation might have been impeded, the second of which highlighted the great esteem in which Bayle held Simon's scholarship and how far Bayle seemed to agree with Simon's opinions.⁹⁶

Throughout this period Bayle recognized the merits of Simon the critic.⁹⁷ In his review of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* Bayle made out to be perplexed as to why the work had been forbidden in Paris when large parts of it, especially those concerning the role of church tradition, appeared strongly favourable to the Catholic cause. The most probable reason, he averred, was that someone who penetrated so learnedly into such sensitive subjects always ran the risk of being rejected initially before becoming widely accepted. Simon was like Jerome: he had risked the opprobrium of contemporaries, but in the long term he would come to receive praise and esteem.⁹⁹

In each catalogue entry and review until mid-1685, Bayle emphasized Simon's moral, in addition to his intellectual, qualities, arguing that Simon was remarkably free from *odium theologicum*.¹⁰⁰ Bayle put this claim to use in two ways. First, as we saw in the case of the Simon's synopsis for a new polyglot edition of the Bible, and also evident in the articles devoted to the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, Bayle encouraged Protestants to read and engage with Simon's work, despite the fact that he was a Catholic.¹⁰¹ Second, however, Bayle also used his interpretation of Simon's apparent confessional neutrality for his own confessional purposes, demonstrating how Simon's work could be taken to undermine the claims of other Roman Catholics and the Roman Catholic Church, more generally. The *Histoire critique de la Créance et des Coûtumes des Nations du Levant* showed how far removed the Roman Church was from antiquity, and how misleading in this instance the whole concept of tradition could be.¹⁰² The journal's serial form gave Bayle this polemical flexibility: where in the context of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* he had disparaged the authorities in Paris for failing to recognize Simon's appeals to tradition could be taken to favour their position, in the case of the *Histoire critique de la Créance et des Coûtumes des Nations du Levant* he wielded Simon's ecclesiastical scholarship to undermine directly the Catholic cause.

Bayle's extensive treatment of the content of Simon's works was subject to a change of emphasis, one coterminous with the biblical critic's decision to engage repeatedly the Protestants Isaac Vossius and Jean Le Clerc in extensive and increasingly vituperative debates. In Article VII of the April 1685 issue Bayle struck the first notes of concern. In

⁹⁵ Labrousse, *Bayle*, 1:190; Bost, *Un "Intellectuel" avant la lettre*, 111-13; François Janiçon to Bayle, 2 Feb 1685, *Bayle Correspondance*, 5:238-9 (§383).

⁹⁶ Janiçon to Bayle, 2 Feb 1685, *Bayle Correspondance* 5:238-9 (§383). Pierre Rainssant would tell Bayle five months later that the journal had since become so scarce that one could only read it by borrowing copies from others: Rainssant to Bayle, 12 July 1685, *Bayle Correspondance*, 5:426 (§439).

⁹⁷ For recent comments on Bayle and criticism to this point in his career, and a subsequent discussion that underlines his 'promotion' of 'Simonian' biblical criticism, see Jean Bernier, 'Pierre Bayle and Biblical Criticism', in *Scriptural Authority and Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Golden Age: God's Word Questioned*, eds. Dirk van Miert et al. (Oxford, 2017), 240-56, at 248-52.

⁹⁹ *NRL* (December 1684), Art. XI, 509-12.

¹⁰⁰ *NRL* (April 1684), 206, 207-8.

¹⁰¹ *NRL* (October 1684), Art. VIII, 295-301; *NRL* (January 1685), Art. IX, 69-80.

¹⁰² *NRL* (May 1684), Art. II, 243.

reviewing Simon's response to Vossius, Bayle identified a feature of the dispute between the two which, he implied, stood for many learned disputes of the time: Simon and Vossius's erudition meant that they could always find – or at least keep repeating – the arguments necessary to support their positions and not yield to their opponent's point of view.¹⁰³ For Bayle this provided a reason why polemical debate in the Republic of Letters generally degenerated from initially polite exchanges to ones increasingly filled with anger or vituperation.¹⁰⁴ The contest between Simon and Vossius had undoubtedly followed this pattern: by the later works Vossius had accused Simon of favouring Spinozism and Simon had responded by arguing Vossius preferred apocryphal texts to those accepted by the church.¹⁰⁵

Bayle's article had a short addendum, in which he wrote that he had recently received a letter via a friend from a 'M. Saldenus'. This was Guillaume Salden, a minister in the Dutch Republic, who in 1684 had published his *Otia theologica* in Amsterdam.¹⁰⁶ A chapter in this work had dealt with the subject of the authorship of the Pentateuch, strongly criticising Simon's apparent denial of Mosaic authorship.¹⁰⁷ Simon abruptly dismissed Salden in the new preface to the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, and refused to acknowledge the author was worthy of a scholarly reply.¹⁰⁸ In his addendum, however, Bayle informed his readers that although he had been sent a letter that defended Salden from Simon's rebuke, it would not be published, since Salden, not wanting to render the invective more violent still, had prevented Bayle from doing so, a decision the journalist could only praise.¹⁰⁹

Between these two alternatives, it was that of Vossius, rather than Salden, which Simon and his opponents tended to choose in the following two years. Simon's increasingly strong rhetoric against his Protestant opponents struck at the way in which Bayle had used a posture of neutrality to further his confessional commitments. Where the relative liberty of the Dutch print trade had allowed Bayle freely to use the works of Malebranche, Arnaud, and Simon to provide direct and indirect critiques of Catholic belief and contemporary France, it nonetheless became much more problematic when Simon used that same freedom to criticize the Reformed religion and the members of that faith.

These exchanges meant that Bayle could no longer describe Simon's demeanour as praiseworthy, preferring instead to pass over such matters in silence. His correspondence, however, reveals how his views had changed: in a letter to Jean Bruguère de Naudis Bayle underlined his displeasure that Simon conducted himself with such ferocity, not just against his adversaries, but all Protestants.¹¹⁰ Bayle had not

¹⁰³ *NRL* (April 1685), Art. VII, 407-8.

¹⁰⁴ *ibid.*, 408.

¹⁰⁵ On this debate, see Mandelbrote, 'Vossius and the Septuagint', 100-9.

¹⁰⁶ Guillaume Salden, *Otia Theologica* (Amsterdam, 1684), 18-36. The work had been sent to Bayle for review in the *NRL* by Jean Le Clerc: Le Clerc to Bayle, 8 June 1684, *Bayle Correspondance*, 4:163 (§285). For the review, see *NRL* (June 1684), Art. VI, 375-89.

¹⁰⁷ Salden, *Otia Theologica*, 18-36.

¹⁰⁸ Simon, *Histoire critique* (Rotterdam: Leers, 1685), sigs **3^v-[**4]^v.

¹⁰⁹ *NRL* (April 1685), Art. VII, 412.

¹¹⁰ Bayle to Jean Bruguère de Naudis, 26 Nov 1685, *Bayle Correspondance*, 6:118 (§486).

yet broken irrevocably with Pierre Jurieu, and in a review of the latter's *L'Accomplissement des prophéties* (1686) noted how Simon, in his *Réponse au livre intitulé Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande* (1686), had conducted himself in a 'very shocking' manner.¹¹¹ Jurieu's subsequent rebuke of Simon treated the latter as he deserved, Bayle later wrote to Vincent Minutoli. The biblical scholar was at root 'un impie' let loose 'like a horse, or like an enraged mastiff' among the Reformed.¹¹²

Bayle's treatment of Simon from early 1685 onwards was further complicated by the role played by the Arminian Jean Le Clerc. In November that year Bayle reported that those readers who had written complaining of Simon's apparently unfair treatment of a Protestant scholar were mistaken since it was Le Clerc himself who was to blame for the acrimonious confessional hue the debate between the two had taken on.¹¹³ This was by no means the first time Bayle had been critical Le Clerc's work on confessional or theological grounds. Le Clerc's *Entretiens sur diverse matières de théologie* (1684), Bayle had warned, contained any number of outbursts against 'standard theology [théologie ordinaire]' and openly attacked the Trinity and Incarnation.¹¹⁴ The boldness of the *Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande*, similarly, would only serve to render the Arminians more odious; the best thing Calvinists could do would be to distance themselves from the sect.¹¹⁵ Bayle's concerns on this score reflected both his criticism of Le Clerc's approach to the inspiration of Scripture, and also the potential risk posed to Protestant religion should they risk holding or be associated with such doctrines.¹¹⁶

In his final article on Simon in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* Bayle could return to his preferred ground.¹¹⁷ The second of Simon's replies to Le Clerc was bound after a piece in which Simon criticized the opinions of fellow Catholics – notably Louis Ellies Du Pin – and Spinoza on the question of the inspiration of Scripture.¹¹⁸ Bayle had little objection to explaining in great detail how Simon and other Catholics differed from one another in their views of the biblical text. He had less still, moreover, reporting Simon's subtle criticism of Spinoza. The review ended, and here one may judge Bayle grateful, with a note that said the latest response to Le Clerc was not yet printed and so could not be commented upon.¹²⁰

¹¹¹ *NRL* (March 1686), Art. VI, 296: 'Le dernier chapitre du I. tome regard M. Simon qui s'est emporté d'une manière très-choquante contre M. Jurieu dans sa réponse aux *Sentimens de quelques Théologiens*'. For Simon's criticism of Jurieu, see [Richard Simon], *Réponse au Livre intitulé Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande sur l'Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament* (Rotterdam, 1686), 218-21.

¹¹² Pierre Bayle to Vincent Minutoli, 8 July 1686, *Bayle Correspondance*, 7:13-14 (§593): 'Vous aurez pû voir dans *L'Accomplissement des prophéties* de Mr Jurieu, que ce Mr Simon s'est fait des affaires avec lui. On l'a traité comme il le mérite; car c'est dans le fond un impie, qui pour faire sa cour aux persécuteurs de France, s'est déchainé sur nous, comme un cheval, ou comme un dogue enragé, dans son dernier livre'. For Jurieu's criticism of Simon, see [Pierre Jurieu], *L'Accomplissement des prophéties ou la delivrance prochaine de l'Église*, 2 vols. (Rotterdam, 1686), 1:354-74.

¹¹³ *NRL* (November 1685), Art. VIII, 1258-9.

¹¹⁴ Bayle to Le Clerc, 23 April 1685, *Bayle Correspondance*, 5:345 (§413).

¹¹⁵ Bayle to Jacques Lenfant, 6 July 1685, *Bayle Correspondance*, 5:420 (§436).

¹¹⁶ Pierre Bayle to Jean Le Clerc, 18 July 1685, *Bayle Correspondance*, 5:430-2 (§441).

¹¹⁷ *NRL* (December 1686), Art. VII, 1446-55.

¹¹⁸ [Richard Simon], *Lettre à Monsieur l'Abbé P[iro]. D. et P. en Th. touchant l'Inspiration des Livres Sacrés* (Rotterdam, 1687), 31-7, 45-8. See further Levitin's chapter in this volume.

¹²⁰ *NRL* (December 1686), December, Art. VII, 1455.

The *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, and the depiction of Simon's works found therein, was therefore the product of a series of demands that could lead in different directions: Bayle at once had to meet the requirements of the print trade while also fitting his reviews to his own learned and polemical objectives. Where the former owed most to his relationship to Reinier Leers, the latter was found both in Bayle's – especially initial – appreciation of Simon's scholarship and the way in which he attempted to wield Simon's work to meet his confessional commitments, a task that became more difficult as Simon's arguments with his Protestant adversaries progressed.

7. Richard Simon and the Roman Index

As the authorities in France, so would those in Rome come be unnerved by Bayle's reviews of Simon's works in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*.¹²¹ This, however, only came in 1689, when Bayle's journal was the subject of censure, and when Simon himself had already been the subject of a lengthy inquest in Rome. The case of Simon's treatment at the hands of the Roman Index presents an important contrast to the Parisian and Dutch contexts we have hitherto focused on. Not least, this was due to the way in which Simon's works posed acute challenges for the Index owing precisely to the complicated print history outlined thus far, as Catholic authorities far removed from the Northern European centre of print attempted to track down and uncover what they could about Simon's work. Charting these attempts provides a glimpse not only of how the Index functioned during this period, but also how works of erudition were received and understood in a Roman setting and how the print culture we have hitherto examined could shape this process.

Simon's *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* first came to Rome's attention in 1682, when a copy of Simon's work in the 1680 Amsterdam printing was passed on to the Secretary of the Index, Giacomo Ricci, and sent to be reviewed by Laurentius Boulboul, a member of the Order of Caracciolini and a frequent *consultor* for the Index throughout the 1670s and early 1680s.¹²² Boulboul was critical of aspects of Simon's work, notably its implications for the Pentateuch's Mosaicity, Simon's account of the extent of textual variation between the different versions of the text (especially his references to the errors contained in the great manuscript of the Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus), and his apparent diminution of the authority of the Vulgate.¹²³ Boulboul was more generally positive in his appraisal of Simon's work: he underlined Simon's

¹²¹ See Marta Fattori, 'Le censure di Antonio Baldigiani alla rivista "Nouvelles de la République des Lettres" di Pierre Bayle', *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* 26 (2006), 105–21, at 114–19; J. M. De Bujanda, *Index des livres interdits*, vol. 11: *Index librorum prohibitorum 1600-1966* (Geneva, 2002), 115. Both authorities, it is worth noting, were audiences Bayle had in mind when writing his reviews. See his 'Préface', in *NRL* (March 1684), sig. *5^r.

¹²² Archivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede [henceforth ACDF], Diario 7, 14 April 1682, 159, where the *censura* is committed to Boulboul, with the return of Boulboul's verdict subsequently reported on 2 June 1682 (162). For an earlier account of this initial censure of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* by the Index, see Mandelbrote, 'Vossius and the Septuagint', 99–109. Giacomo Ricci was Secretary from 1676–1684. On the Index generally in this period see, for now, Elisa Rebellato, *La fabbrica dei divieti. Gli indici dei libri proibiti da Clemente VII a Benedetto XIV* (Milan, 2008).

¹²³ ACDF, Protocolli RR, fols 411^r–412^v.

erudition, discussed how his ideas undermined Protestant tenets regarding scriptural integrity, and concluded that Simon's book ought to be permitted after correcting the suspect passages.¹²⁴ This view was evidently not shared by the members of the Index, however, and the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* was prohibited by the Congregation.¹²⁵

This was only the start of the Index's engagement with Simon's work. In September 1685 the Secretary Giulio Maria Bianchi reported that a 'very dangerous work' written in French, the *Histoire critique de la Créance et des Coûtumes des Nations du Levant*, had been brought to his attention.¹²⁶ Its censure was entrusted to Emmanuel Schelstrate, who returned a resoundingly negative verdict. Schelstrate outlined that the censure would become much too long were it to focus on enumerating every mistake in the work, and focused instead on the author's serious doctrinal errors and additional misunderstandings on the subjects of the practice of confession, simony, and the possibility of reconciling the Nestorian and Roman Catholic views on Christ's nature.¹²⁷ These positions, Schelstrate outlined, would have been serious enough were they a direct attack from a heretic, but the author's claims to be a Catholic only rendered it a more serious threat: few were more dangerous than those who used the cover of orthodoxy to spread such errors.¹²⁸ Schelstrate's condemnation of the work itself was categorical, but it was also lacking a precise target beyond the text itself, for both he, and the Index, failed to detect who was behind the pseudonym 'Le Sieur de Moni'. The subterfuge Simon had had recourse to in the Netherlands had succeeded in deceiving the censors, and they had not yet been able to read Bayle's *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* in such a way as to decipher the work's true author.¹²⁹

The advance of theses deemed unacceptable for Catholic scholarship was likewise repeated shortly after in the case of Simon's *Novorum Bibliorum Polyglottorum Synopsis*. Having been reported to the Secretary in early 1686 the Congregation took two decisive steps. First, they ordered the censure of the work to be carried by Raphael Fabretti.¹³⁰ Like Schelstrate, Fabretti was disconcerted by the suggestion that the author was a Catholic, suggesting instead that he strongly suspected it was the deceitful work of a heretic, especially on account of the book's attitude to the Vulgate.¹³¹ Fabretti focused his whole censure on this subject, discussing at length the ways in which the claims it made regarding the Vulgate's shortcomings evidently contradicted the stipulations of the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent. He explained that although he did not deny the possibility that the Vulgate could err, it nonetheless had to be insisted

¹²⁴ ACDF, Protocolli RR, fol. 412^v.

¹²⁵ ACDF, Diario 8, 9 Feb 1683, 4; De Bujanda, *Index librorum prohibitorum*, 11:837, lists the 1678 edition, rather than the 1680.

¹²⁶ ACDF, Diario 8, 8 Sep 1685, 77, 'Secret. dixit apud se recusatum fuisse ... valde perniciosum librum gallico idiomate'. Giulio Maria Bianchi was Secretary from 1684-1707.

¹²⁷ ACDF, Protocolli VV, fols 40^r-41^r.

¹²⁸ ACDF, Protocolli VV, fol. 41^{r-v}.

¹²⁹ For the prohibition of the work, see, ACDF, Diario 8, 2 July 1685, 131; De Bujanda, *Index librorum prohibitorum*, 11:836.

¹³⁰ Fabretti was also responsible for the censure of Isaac Vossius's work in this period, for which, see Mandelbrote, 'Vossius and the Septuagint', 108-9.

¹³¹ ACDF, Protocolli VV, fol. 177^r.

that the Church could not err in its decision regarding that text's authority. Above all, a private individual, rather than the Church, could not be given the liberty to judge arbitrarily which variant readings ought or ought not be preferred to others.¹³² On this basis Fabretti insisted the work be prohibited, adding that this should be done none too soon, since the author requested subscriptions to fund the work, and they should act fast to prevent any Catholics from supporting the project.¹³³

The second move the Congregation made was to investigate the projected polyglot and who was behind it. To do so, they proceeded as they had done some years earlier in the case of Spinoza's works: they had the Secretary write to an ecclesiastical representative in Northern Europe, in this case the Papal Internuncio in Flanders, Sebastiano Antonio Tanara, and ordered him to find out what he could about the work and its author.¹³⁴ Tanara took the Congregation's orders seriously, responding to the Congregation's request by detailing that he had written to the Nuncio in France, Angelo Ranuzzi and, in the Netherlands, to the Apostolic Vicar of the Dutch Mission in order to find out more information.¹³⁵ Tanara benefited from a quick reply from Ranuzzi, who had tracked down the bookseller Daniel Horthemels – one of those listed in the prospectus – who informed Ranuzzi that the author was none other than Richard Simon, an Oratorian.¹³⁶ At this stage events moved quickly, as the Secretary hastily replied to Tanara to find out everything he could about Simon and his work.¹³⁷ A request to which Tanara could only, for the moment, respond to by informing Rome that Ranuzzi was proceeding diligently to do so.¹³⁸

Ranuzzi's efforts eventually yielded definitive results.¹³⁹ He successfully obtained from Jean Bahier, Secretary of the Oratory, an authoritative account of Simon's expulsion from the order, one that detailed how Simon had misled Edme Pirot, censor and syndic of the Sorbonne, about the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*'s false or dangerous propositions in order to have the work published.¹⁴⁰ Bahier's letter caused the Index to retrieve hastily the verdict it had given the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*

¹³² ACDF, Protocolli VV, fols 177^v-178^r.

¹³³ ACDF, Protocolli VV, fol. 178^v. For the agreement of the Congregation and prohibition of the work, see ACDF, Diario 8, 2 July 1685, 134; De Bujanda, *Index librorum prohibitorum*, 11:837.

¹³⁴ ACDF, Diario 8, 29 Jan 1686, 101. See, for the prohibition of Spinoza's work, ACDF Diario 7, 6 Dec 1678, 126, and, for the corresponding efforts to uncover more about Spinoza, see Jean Orcibal, 'Les Jansénistes face à Spinoza', *Revue de la littérature comparée* 23 (1949), 441-68.

¹³⁵ ACDF, Protocolli VV, Sebastiano Antonio Tanara to Giulio Maria Bianchi, 9 Aug 1686, fol. 310^r.

¹³⁶ ACDF, Protocolli VV, Sebastiano Antonio Tanara to Giulio Maria Bianchi, 23 Aug 1686, fol. 311^r. Horthemels, a convert to Catholicism who was only received into the *Communauté des Libraires* in 1686, played an appreciable role in the international trade during this and the following period. See Martin, *Livre, pouvoirs et société*, 2:726, based on information taken from the important probate inventories found at Arch. Nat. Min. Central. XXIII, 366 (11 Dec 1691); XLIX 399 (9 June 1692).

¹³⁷ ACDF, Diario 8, 29 Nov 1686, 158.

¹³⁸ ACDF, Protocolli VV, Sebastiano Antonio Tanara to Giulio Maria Bianchi, Nov 1686, fol. 451^r.

¹³⁹ ACDF, Diario, 8, 21 Jan 1687, 166, where Bianchi detailed he was writing again to Tanara to see where the affair stood.

¹⁴⁰ ACDF, Protocolli XX, Jean Bahier to Sebastiano Antonio Tanara, 3 Jan 1687, fol. 18^{r-v}, for the French original; ACDF, Protocolli XX, 17^r, contains a translation into Italian for the Congregation. It was read to the Congregation on 17 March, for which, see ACDF, Diario 8, 17 March 1687, 182.

in 1682, and Bianchi reported that the Congregation had prohibited the 1680 edition.¹⁴¹ This established, Bianchi outlined the further steps that had to be taken in the matter, notably those regarding other works by Simon that had not hitherto been prohibited.¹⁴² These comprised of a series of Simon's responses to his Protestant critics: two to Vossius, and Simon's first response to Jean Le Clerc. All three works were then committed to Giacomo Ricci for censure.¹⁴³

Ricci's verdict, unlike Boulboul's earlier even-handed treatment of the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, was resoundingly negative. Where Boulboul had openly approved of Simon's learning, recommending only some modifications to the work, Ricci, in contrast, detailed how Simon's works treated the Vulgate, picking out and accumulating comments from the three works in question that expressly undermined that text's authority, directly contradicting Ricci's own interpretation of Trent's decrees.¹⁴⁴ The majority of these were simply comments where Simon indicated, for example, that the post-Tridentine Vulgate that had been declared authentic was not free from errors.¹⁴⁵ Yet, Ricci was also attuned to more oblique threats to the Vulgate's authority: in discussing Simon's reply to Vossius Ricci was particularly alert to the implications of Simon's remarks concerning Jerome's work, the way in which scholars learned in Hebrew and Greek had felt free to correct his version, and how far, in general, Simon thus highlighted purported errors Jerome had made.¹⁴⁶ Ricci appealed to Bellarmine's learning and authority in order to make the point that since the Vulgate recognized by Trent was ultimately Jerome's version, any such indirect criticism was likewise illegitimate.¹⁴⁷ Ricci unsurprisingly recommended all the works for condemnation, a verdict agreed by the Congregation.¹⁴⁸

Ricci's censure together with the efforts of Bianchi to find out more information about Simon and his work through Tanara and Ranuzzi would be crucial in determining Simon's image as a suspect Catholic author in the eyes of the Congregation. Many of his subsequent publications, including his critical studies of the New Testament and the *Bibliothèque critique* (1707-1710) would subsequently be harshly treated in extensive censures, and thereafter prohibited.¹⁴⁹ Simon's treatment at the hands of the Index was redolent of the concern with which Rome judged a Catholic author who departed, either on questions of ecclesiastical or biblical scholarship, from the positions then held as

¹⁴¹ ACDF, Protocolli XX, 86^v-87^r; ACDF, Diario 8, 27 May 1687, 198. This copy is still today found in the Biblioteca Casanatense, at KK v 45, where it is identifiable as the copy prohibited owing to the cross on the spine. I would like to thank John Robertson for the information regarding this copy.

¹⁴² ACDF, Diario 8, 27 May 1687, 199.

¹⁴³ ACDF, Protocolli XX, fols 242^r-244^v. The works were: [Simon], *Opuscula Critica adversus Isaacum Vossium*; [Simon], *Judicium de nupera Isaaci Vossii ad iteratas P. Simonii Objectiones Responsione*; [Simon], *Réponse au livre intitulé Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande*.

¹⁴⁴ ACDF, Protocolli XX, fols 242^r-244^v.

¹⁴⁵ ACDF, Protocolli XX, fol. 242^v.

¹⁴⁶ ACDF, Protocolli XX, fol. 242^r, referring, in particular, to [Simon], *Opuscula Critica adversus Isaacum Vossium*, 27, 73-77.

¹⁴⁷ ACDF, Protocolli XX, fol. 242^{r-v}.

¹⁴⁸ ACDF, Protocolli XX, fol. 244^v; ACDF, Diario 8, 22 Sep 1687, 222; De Bujanda, *Index librorum prohibitorum*, 11:836-7.

¹⁴⁹ ACDF, Protocolli DDD, 145^r-146^r; ACDF, Protocolli CCCC, fols 19^r-23^v; De Bujanda, *Index librorum prohibitorum*, 11:836-7.

Roman orthodoxy. In the context of biblical criticism, in particular, it reflected the predominance of a view that had developed favouring a strict interpretation of the Tridentine decree regarding the Vulgate, and the paramount importance attached to defending its authority in comparison to other versions.¹⁵⁰ Simon's case also demonstrates the problems and challenges that the rise of the Dutch Republic as a centre of print could create or exacerbate for the Index, as it was forced to mount a determined investigation over a prolonged period to uncover and overcome the subterfuge with which Leers had published the works of a prohibited critic.

8. Conclusion

The Roman *censura* provides a counterpoint to the article in the early learned journal. Although both gave short, often pithy assessments of the work in question, their overarching objectives pointed in different directions: where one was the private possession of an authoritative institution, focused on assessing how far a work should be deemed problematic and have its circulation circumscribed, the other was a commercial product directed towards highlighting why the work should be read, widening as far as possible its market. Between these two sets of concerns the case of Richard Simon is illustrative of these contrasts: as the intersection of learning and commerce saw Bayle and the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* shape the reception of Simon's works, so, in contrast, did the Roman Index, its secretaries, censors, and network of ecclesiastical informants, do their best to try and uncover and eventually prohibit what Leers and others had disguised.

This comparison, however, should not obscure what continued to be common in this world of learning. Both Bayle and Boulboul, for example, could evidence their appreciation of Simon's erudition. Further, and perhaps most importantly, this study also shows the continued priority attached to confessional commitments in this period: where Bayle attempted to exploit Simon's work to his advantage in this context only to be disappointed when Simon and his opponents' positions worked directly against his purposes, so too was the Roman Index chiefly preoccupied with understanding the implications of Simon's works for the Vulgate or other theological or ecclesiastical doctrines.

The one distinct way in which Bayle differed from the Index was in the active role he played in the circulation of Simon's work. The study of this distinctive role – linked to the broader publishing context in which it took place – leaves us in a position to investigate further how far Simon's case is only one part of a broader series of changes in late seventeenth-century learning, as the reframing of erudition in new editions or learned journals removed it from the context of its creation, and how this, and the shift to the vernacular more generally, created an apparent caesura in the history of scholarship, where, rather than a crisis, this period saw a slow and complicated process of transition that has gone hitherto untraced.

¹⁵⁰ Timothy Twining, 'Criticism, Confession, and the Roman Index: The Cases of Louis Cappel, the London Polyglot Bible, and Richard Simon' (forthcoming).

